

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

JOHN THOMAS ENTLER,

Plaintiff,

v.

FRANCISCO PERALES, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. C07-5167 FDB/KLS

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS'
MOTION TO EXTEND TIME TO
RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT

This civil rights action has been referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge pursuant to Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local MJR 3 and 4. Presently before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (Dkt. # 27) and Defendants' motions to extend the time to respond to Plaintiff's motion. (Dkt. # 30 and 32¹). Plaintiff opposes the motion. (Dkt. # 33).

Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (Dkt. # 27) is presently noted for hearing on June 20, 2008. Defendants contend, *inter alia*, that their time to respond to Plaintiff's motion must be extended so that they can conduct deposition and written discovery of the Plaintiff and that the interests of justice require an extension so that their own summary judgment can be heard simultaneous with Plaintiff's motion. (Dkt. # 30, p. 2).

¹Dkt. # 32 entitled Praecipe re Motion for Extension appears to be a duplicate filing that is dated.

1 Defendants offered no explanation of why no discovery has been conducted over the past
2 five months. Additionally, since the filing of their motion for an extension of time, Defendants
3 filed a response to Plaintiff's motion (Dkt. # 34) and a motion for summary judgment (Dkt. # 35).

4 Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

- 5 (1) Defendants' motions for continuance of time to respond to Plaintiffs' motion for
6 summary judgment (Dkts. # 30 & 32) are **DENIED**.

7
8 DATED this 5th day of June, 2008.

9
10 
11 Karen L. Strombom
12 United States Magistrate Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25